

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19525

by the subcommittee chairman, a letter, dated September 12, 1963, which, in substance requested advice as to why such an arbitrarily low exchange rate had been established.

By letter of October 11, 1963, from the Secretary, after an explanation to the effect that 24 zlotys to \$1 was the best rate the U.S. negotiators could get in negotiating the sales to Poland, it was pointed out that any of the sales proceeds which the United States did not use, would, by the terms of the agreement, be repaid by Poland in dollars, after a specified number of years, at the same rate, and that as the disbursing officer's sales to the U.S. agencies were also at 24 to \$1, no loss to the U.S. Government was involved. In other words, it was simply bypassing the law. Accordingly, why is there any need to change section 101(f), if we are not losing money under it now, provided Poland lives up to its agreement and we do not decide later to give Poland most of the proceeds? Why should we change the law, so that we shall begin to lose money on such transactions? Again, let me point out that we did not have to make the sales to Poland at substantially less than half of the world market price; and, accordingly, the decision to make these sales had to be a purely political determination, and in the interest of foreign aid. Incidentally, it is my understanding that the Treasury Department reportedly was unable to advise the committee what a realistic exchange rate between the United States and Poland would be at the present time; but if we ask any traveler who recently has been in Poland, he will tell us that, except from the U.S. disbursing officer and from official Polish banks, one can obtain throughout Poland 75 zlotys to \$1, and nobody asks any questions.

I think the facts that I have given show ample reason why an amendment such as this should not be attached to the foreign aid authorization act, and I again urge my colleagues who will attend the conference with the House on this bill not to recede to the House position on section 402(a) of H.R. 7885.

## OTHER PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

The other proposed amendments in the House bill; namely, sections 402(b) and 402(c), I object to on the principle which I have stated earlier.

There are two amendments to H.R. 7885 proposed by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations which relate to a change in the Public Law 480 law. While I have not studied these amendments and offhand see no great objection to them in substance—as stated before, I see no reason for their inclusion at this time in the foreign aid bill, as we will have an opportunity—hopefully, early next year—to review the whole Public Law 480 act, at which time they can be considered in proper context.

The first amendment, section 403(a) would change section 104(e) of Public Law 480 to permit an increase from 25 percent to 50 percent of foreign currency proceeds from title I sales to be used for loans to private business—Cooley (e) loans—and to broaden the purposes for which these loans might be made. I might say here, in passing, that where

104(e) money is presently available, it is due to the fact that the country does not have a favorable climate for investment, or is socialistically inclined and restricts this type of private loan. Where it is in short supply, the present purposes for which loans can be made are entirely sufficient to use all of the currencies available.

The other amendment, contained in section 403 (b) and (c), would make it possible to include fish as a commodity in Public Law 480 sales under titles I and IV. As the effective date of this amendment would not be until January 1, 1965, such an amendment could be included in next year's Public Law 480 act, with no loss.

Mr. President, in passing, let me say that I have no objection whatever to the inclusion of fish as a commodity for sale under Public Law 480, but I think it should be done in the proper manner through the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, as I stated, I have a number of amendments that I shall submit to the Senate which I have not discussed. I hope to discuss them when the time comes to consider the amendments.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the Senator's yielding, for the reason that he discussed the amendment which would strike out the provision for 25 percent which is permitted to be loaned under the Cooley funds and substitute a 50-percent loan. I mention that subject because the Senator referred to my amendment. I submitted it for a definite reason. There are funds in many countries which need housing programs. I am advised that those funds could be used to great advantage for housing. While we have had difficulty in securing loan programs, it seems to me that there was one place in which we might, to great advantage, use Public Law 480 funds for a housing program rather than permitting those funds to lie around and not be used. That is my only reason for offering the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. The entire Public Law 480 program will be revamped next year. It is my belief that such amendments should be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and not here. Several amendments to Public Law 480 have been proposed which in my judgment should not be offered to the bill. There are amendments relating not only to Public Law 480, but also to other subjects which in my judgment should not be considered in connection with foreign aid bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I assure the Senator from Louisiana that, as far as I am concerned, no one is more familiar with the language of the law and the use of the funds authorized under Public Law 480 than is the Senator from Louisiana. Therefore, I appreciate the statement that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will next year revise the act, or at least study it with the hope of revision. But I did not desire personally to

be in a position in which we would use dollars and not the funds we have already accumulated under Public Law 480. That is my only point.

Mr. ELLENDER. I very much appreciate that suggestion from the Senator from Kansas. As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I assure the Senator that one of our first tasks when we return next year will be to revise Public Law 480 and to see to that the funds to which he has referred will be properly spent not only for our benefit but also for the benefit of the host countries that have them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I withhold the suggestion.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope that the Senator will make the quorum call a live quorum call. There has not been one for 3 days. Senators get out of the habit of even coming into the Chamber. There ought to be a live quorum call at least every 3 days.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think that is a good idea. I ask the attachés of the Senate to advise Senators that the quorum call will be a live quorum call.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield for a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Louisiana tell me by what amount his amendments would reduce the total appropriation recommended by the Committee on Foreign Relations? I understand that the Senator from Louisiana has several different levels. What would be the maximum reduction?

Mr. ELLENDER. Approximately \$650 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would that reduction bring the bill down to the House figure?

Mr. ELLENDER. Almost.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It would be above the House figure?

Mr. ELLENDER. Slightly; but I have other amendments to offer which would probably bring the amount within the range of the House figure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the maximum. Does the Senator have a second level of reduction?

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to see the figure lower than the House figure because, as I said in my main argument, we should begin to taper off the program and not increase it from year to year.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

*Cuba file*  
USE OF SHIPS IN TRADE WITH CUBA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in May of this year, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, of which I am

19526

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 30

privileged to be chairman, issued a report of its investigation into the Soviet military buildup in Cuba, pointed out the menace to the Western Hemisphere presented by communism in Cuba, and warned the Nation of the necessity for alertness and vigilance to all its sinister implications.

In recognition of the dangers presented by communism only 90 miles from our shores, the administration has taken certain steps to isolate Cuba through economic moves, including regulations to prevent or reduce the ocean traffic to Cuba in free world ships. Unfortunately, these regulations may have operated to accelerate and assist such traffic, rather than impede it. Since such traffic had increased rather than decreased, I submitted, on September 11, an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, S. 1276, designed to make it less attractive to our allies to continue carrying vital cargoes to Cuba, which only helps to perpetuate the communist regime of Fidel Castro.

The amendment was identical with an amendment offered in the House, and the substance of these amendments is included in the bill recommended to the Senate by the Foreign Relations Committee.

The language of my amendment would broaden and strengthen existing legislation and plug the loopholes in existing legislation. These loopholes have, for example, permitted the United States to furnish continuing military assistance to free world countries which were nevertheless carrying Soviet bloc crude oil to Cuba.

As provided in the amendments the reported bill would:

First. Broaden the scope of existing legislation—section 107 of the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act of 1962—to deny assistance of any kind to any country failing to take steps to prevent vessels under its registry from carrying to Cuba, equipment, materials, or commodities, in addition to military items which have been embargoed under the Battle Act. Presently only the Battle Act items plus those commodities designated as items of economic assistance, fall within the proscription of the statute;

Second. Broaden the coverage of existing law to deny any assistance in the case where equipment, materials, or commodities are transported from, as well as to, Cuba—presently, only the latter situation is within the statute.

Third. Prohibit the furnishing of assistance to countries in the Cuba trade which permit planes of their registry to transport materiel of war to or from Cuba—presently such transportation is not forbidden by the statute providing foreign assistance.

There is a crying necessity for putting more teeth—stronger teeth—into the existing law. The present law denies economic assistance, alone, to countries permitting their ships to transport items of economic assistance to Cuba, but these countries nevertheless are permitted to receive military assistance from the United States. The new language would plug the loophole in a number of re-

spects, particularly in the case of crude oil, a critical military item which is being transported to Cuba in free world ships of countries receiving large amounts of assistance from this country.

Our experience since January 1, 1963, indicates that the following military aid program recipients have permitted the use of their ships for trade with Cuba: Great Britain, Lebanon, Italy, Norway, Denmark, and West Germany. It does not appear, however, that West German or Danish ships are now engaged in the Cuban trade. In fact, West Germany has recently taken legal steps to prevent this.

However, some of our other so-called free world allies have not been so cooperative. Italy, for example, which received \$300 million in military and economic assistance in fiscal year 1963 was continuing through August to send vessels under its registry into the Cuban trade.

While there is no evidence that any free world country has itself furnished any Battle Act commodities or "items of economic assistance" to Cuba, since January 1, 1963, some free world tankers have transported Soviet bloc crude oil to Cuba. Since crude oil has not been placed on the Battle Act list of embargoed commodities, military assistance is not prohibited to countries which permit ships of their registry to transport this bloc crude oil. The amendment would correct this situation and should prove an important step in imposing the burden of crude oil and other petroleum delivery on already burdened Soviet bloc transport capability.

Unfortunately trade with Cuba through free world ships—plus Polish and Yugoslav ships—has continued on a very large scale although some steps have been taken in the direction of isolating Cuba from the economic life of the free world. Such steps include a ban on transportation of U.S. financed goods by ships which have been to Cuba; an embargo on U.S. trade with Cuba and steps to freeze Cuban assets in this country.

Notwithstanding these efforts, however, it appears that free world shipping to Cuba has been increased through a great part of 1963 and exceeded Russian shipping in the Cuba trade although Russia was far ahead at the beginning of the year.

It is evident from the figures obtained from naval intelligence and the Maritime Administration that free world shipping to Cuba has been increasing steadily over that of Russia shipping since April of this year and that the trend in this increase became clear much earlier in the year.

Since the beginning of this year, numerous free world nations have allowed their flag ships to carry Russian and Soviet bloc goods to Cuba. During the period January 1, 1963, through September 20, 1963, the leaders in this shipping have been as follows: Britain, 93 trips; Greece, 81 trips; Lebanon, 40 trips; Italy, 14; Norway, 13. This is to name just a few of the countries carrying bloc goods to Cuba. Preliminary estimates show that Britain, Greece, Norway, and

Italy alone, have been the recipients of \$488 million in military and economic assistance for fiscal year 1963 alone.

Now let me introduce a table comparing free world shipping and Russian shipping to Cuba during 1963 which shows that although Russian shipping to Cuba in January 1963 led free world shipping 35 trips to 12; by April the free world held the lead 37 to 27 and has continued to hold this dubious honor.

## Shipping to Cuba

	Free world	Russian
January.....	12	35
February.....	19	34
March.....	28	32
April.....	37	27
May.....	44	38
June.....	43	31
July.....	45	31
August.....	29	23

It is a chilling fact to contemplate, but the increase in free world shipping by nations receiving our assistance has been spurred—it is reported—by the premium rates being paid by the Soviets. The Soviets pay these bonus rates since present U.S. regulations, as stated, provide that any foreign vessel in the Cuban trade stopping at Cuba is ineligible to carry U.S.-financed cargoes. So the Russians make it up to them. These mercenary so-called allies have it both ways then—by assistance from us and by premium payments from the Russians.

I say that we should tell these countries that they cannot have it both ways, and I think these provisions should go a long way in bringing that message home to these greedy countries. If they want our help it is not too much to ask of them that they desist from aiding communism on our doorsteps, the communism that is being exported into so many South American and Central American countries like a spreading cancer.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I congratulate the able Senator from Mississippi on his statement. I know that the American people will be gratified to realize that, as chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, the Senator is constantly following developments in Cuba.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his remarks, and for his very fine assistance. I did not realize that the Senator from Missouri was in the Chamber. I know of his fine interest in the work on this subject.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will defer to the Senator for 1 moment, but I believe there should be a quorum present at least once every 3 days.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] I submit an amendment to the bill now pending before the Senate, which I probably will call up.

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19527

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I renew my suggestion of the absence of a quorum; and I shall object to any suspension of this call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 199 Leg.]

Alken	Hayden	Nelson
Allott	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bartlett	Hill	Pastore
Bayh	Holland	Pearson
Beall	Inouye	Pell
Bennett	Jackson	Prouty
Boggs	Javits	Proxmire
Brewster	Johnston	Randolph
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Keating	Russell
Carlson	Kennedy	Saito
Church	Kuchel	Scott
Clark	Lausche	Simpson
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Curtis	Long, La.	Smith
Dirksen	Mansfield	Sparkman
Dodd	McCarthy	Stennis
Dominick	McClellan	Symington
Douglas	McGee	Talmadge
Eastland	McGovern	Thurmond
Ellender	McIntyre	Tower
Ervin	McNamara	Walters
Fong	Mechem	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Miller	Williams, Del.
Goldwater	Monroney	Yarborough
Gore	Morse	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Morton	Young, Ohio
Hart	Moss	
Hartke	Muskie	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRSKAL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of Senators, the leadership has endeavored to arrive at a unanimous-consent agreement, without success.

In view of the objections to the unanimous-consent agreement, it is our responsibility to advise Senators to remain available for votes, which may come at any time from now on.

We realize that some Senators have longstanding engagements out of Washington, and commitments to participate as Senate delegates in various international conferences, which will take place in the near future. In the NATO conference, in Paris, and in the Common-

wealth Parliamentary Conference at Kuala Lampur, among others.

It is with great reluctance, therefore, that we now urge Senators to cancel all such engagements and commitments, and others, which may not have been mentioned.

Our primary responsibility as Senators, as we all know, is here in this body. In view of the situation which has developed, it seems to us to be incumbent upon every Member of the Senate to remain here in order that this primary responsibility may be discharged.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, of course no one can quarrel with the philosophy of the majority leader's statement. It is our duty to be here. Yet I believe it is quite regrettable that we must cancel attendance at meetings of international conferences, particularly the one with our NATO partners. It is a conference which was authorized by act of Congress, for which funds are made available each year. It was set up because it was felt wise to have a political underpinning for NATO.

This is not the first time that Senators have been prevented from attending a NATO conference. I remember that at the first one no Senator was able to attend. The House Members attended, and they represented us ably, I am sure. However, it does not present a complete representation, and withdraws from the representation the body of Congress that really has the greater responsibility in the field of international relations. It is most deplorable, and particularly to be regretted, that the Senate is denied the privilege of participating in this most important international conference, which has been authorized by the Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sorry that the majority leader has found it necessary to make the announcement he has made. Of course, I do not see what other announcement he could make. There will be those who will seek to make something out of the fact that we who are opposed to the foreign aid bill and who have refused to give unanimous consent to limit debate in order to vote on a certain date, are responsible for the inconvenience to our colleagues in the Senate who wish to go abroad to attend international conferences.

I regret it very much if we inconvenience them. However, that there are procedures which Senators can follow if they feel it is more important to go abroad than to stay here for the debate on the foreign aid bill; that is the procedure of a live pair. They could try that procedure. I have been heard to say before that I believe it is too bad that we have not exercised that custom to the extent that it was formerly exercised.

Important as the international conferences are, I know of nothing connected with our duties that is more important than debating and considering a major piece of legislation involving the foreign aid program. I do not know of any proposed legislation more vital to the country that will come before Congress than the foreign aid program.

I am perfectly willing to take whatever criticism is to be heaped on my shoulders; and I know that my associates, who are also opposed to the bill, will share the responsibility.

We were elected to be here to enact legislation. If international conferences have to be arranged at a time when the Senate is in session, it is too bad for those international conferences, if going to them interferes with the work of the Senate.

There is another proposal that might help Senators who wish to attend the conference, for in due course of time a motion will be made to recommit the bill to the committee, to bring it in line with the committee's report.

If the committee's report is sound, the Committee on Foreign Relations ought to modify the bill to make it consistent with the report. That might require a couple of weeks. If we can obtain the necessary support to recommit the bill, I invite Senators to let me know. When we have our next conference, we will judge when will be the most appropriate time to move to recommit the bill. Then the Committee on Foreign Relations can begin to work on it, and Senators can go on whatever safaris they wish to go on around the world.

It is not pleasant to take the position that Senators ought to stay here and act on the foreign aid bill. I have gone through these battles before. As of now, I will not agree to a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate and to fix a time to vote, because the bill requires a considerable amount of educational discussion for the benefit of Senators who wish to inform themselves about it. Certainly it requires discussion for the benefit of the American people. Whether some of us realize it or not, the American people are exhibiting an increasing interest in the foreign aid bill. They are entitled to know whatever facts we can supply them. Unfortunately, many of the facts cannot be supplied because they are behind an American "iron curtain" of top secrecy, although they involve public business.

I have told the majority leader that I will do my best, joining with other Senators who feel the bill needs to be discussed before the Senate is ready to vote on it, to expedite the debate consistently in what we consider to be the public interest.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. First, I commiserate with the distinguished majority leader for the ideological disarray which is apparently present on the majority side of the aisle. In this case, the majority leader has no alternative. While I have no right to speak for all Senators on this side of the aisle, I wish to tell the majority leader that we over here desire to expedite the disposition of this important legislation. The comments made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are most appropriate and important. Nevertheless, so far as I am concerned, Senators on this side of the aisle wish to move along with the public business.

19528

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 30

In that respect, may I inquire of the distinguished majority leader whether during the remainder of the week he contemplates having the sessions of the Senate continue into the evening and whether he contemplates having a session on Saturday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. At the moment, I do not contemplate a session on Saturday. So far as going into the evening is concerned, it seems to me that the Senate has been recessing at 4 o'clock, 4:30 o'clock, or 5 o'clock because of a lack of speakers and a lack of interest. Unfortunately, the usual number of Senators on the floor during the debate has been three, four, or five. This is too important a bill to have that kind of attendance.

However, the Senate will convene at noon tomorrow and at noon on Friday.

Concerning what the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said, he has been most cooperative. He is acting within his rights. He has a right to express himself as he has and as he usually does on matters of this kind.

So far as the Senator from Alabama is concerned, he also is right, because for many years the Senate and Congress have created committees to meet at certain times of the year with our European counterparts in very important international conferences, if not the most important, to discuss problems of mutual interest.

I know it is disappointing to many Senators to hear this announcement, which I felt I had to make, but only with a sense of deep regret, because I had hoped that some arrangement could be made. But that is the way things go, and we have to "call them as we see them."

Mr. KUCHEL. Meanwhile, if amendments are in order, then I understand, implicit in the majority leader's statement just announced to the Senate, yeas-and-nay votes, or at least a disposition of amendments, will be in order while the Senate remains in session?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; that would be the usual procedure. We should anticipate those things happening. Whether they will, remains to be seen. At least, Senators are all on notice and can act accordingly.

I thank Senators for their courtesy in listening to me.

## NATIONAL OBJECTIVES IN SPACE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration stated recently that:

The \$5.35 billion authorized by the Congress for 1964 constitutes the minimum appropriation which will enable NASA to maintain its momentum, to sustain our on-going programs at an optimum pace, and to achieve our stated national objectives in space.

Now these stated national objectives in space were spelled out in some detail on May 25, 1961, when the President of the United States addressed the Congress on "urgent national goals."

It will be recalled that among those urgent national needs was the landing

of a man on the moon and return him safely to earth before this decade is out. The words the President spoke that day only 2½ years ago concerning space seem as pertinent now as they were then.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have one paragraph from the President's address printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Let it be clear—and this is a judgment which the Members of the Congress must finally make—let it be clear that I am asking the Congress and the country to accept a firm commitment to a new course of action—a course which will last for many years and carry very heavy costs, \$531 million in the fiscal year 1962 and an estimated \$7 to \$9 billion additional over the next 5 years. If we are to go only halfway, or reduce our sights in the face of difficulty, in my judgment it would be better not to go at all. This is a choice which this country must make, and I am confident that under the leadership of the space committees of the Congress and the Appropriations Committees you will consider the matter carefully. It is a most important decision that we make as a nation; but all of you have lived through the last 4 years and have seen the significance of space and the adventures in space, and no one can predict with certainty what the ultimate meaning will be of the mastery of space. I believe we should go to the moon. But I think every citizen of this country as well as the Members of Congress should consider the matter carefully in making their judgment, to which we have given attention over many weeks and months, as it is a heavy burden; and there is no sense in agreeing, or desiring, that the United States take an affirmative position in outer space unless we are prepared to do the work and bear the burdens to make it successful. If we are not, we should decide today.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the President's challenge was clear and bold. Congress accepted it and the NASA has received substantially what it has asked for up to the present time.

Mr. President, why is it this year that we find ourselves going through such an agonizing reappraisal of our space program? I, for one, cannot understand why each time Khrushchev mentions space we should reappraise our own position. If we are not, and have not, been in any race what difference does it make what Russia's moon plans are? If we are in a race why not be frank with the public and say so. During the last few days there have been many interpretations of what Mr. Khrushchev was saying at his latest press conference on space. Frankly, I could care less what he meant. However, since self-serving connotations have been placed on his statement by those who are either for or against our space program, I believe it would be helpful to have the full text of his press statement on space printed at this point in my remarks, so that Congress may judge for itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the press statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Journalist Leopoldo Vargas, of Colombia, asks: "Can you tell us whether a flight to the

moon by Soviet cosmonauts is planned for the not too distant future?"

Khrushchev: "It would be very interesting to take a trip to the moon. But I cannot at present say when this will be done. We are not at present planning flights by cosmonauts to the moon. Soviet scientists are working on this problem. It is being studied as a scientific problem and the necessary research is being done. I have a report to the effect that the Americans want to land a man on the moon by 1970-80. Well, let's wish them success. We shall see how they will fly there, how they will land on the moon and, more important, how they will start off and return home. We shall take their experience into account. We do not want to compete with the sending of people to the moon without careful preparation. It is clear that no benefits would be derived from such a competition. On the contrary, it would be harmful as it might result in the destruction of people. We have a frequently quoted joke: He who cannot bear it any longer on earth may fly to the moon. But we are all right on earth, to speak seriously, much work will have to be done and good preparations made for a successful flight to the moon by man."

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, have the space goals which were so enthusiastically stated and accepted in May of 1961 become unobtainable? I believe they are obtainable. I have listened for over 5 years to many learned people tell our committee what we had done in space; what we were now doing; and what we hoped to do. I am now convinced after 5 years of talk and accomplishments that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration can do about what it says it can do, but not always within the time period it optimistically promises. However, this inability to meet previously announced deadlines is perhaps understandable when one considers the technological tightrope that NASA walks between the known and the unknown.

If our goals have changed since 1961 or they cannot be reached, we should be told so. If there is a lack of urgency because of the latest press release from Moscow we should be told so. If there is no continuing priority because there are new priorities, or too many priorities, we should be told so.

Mr. President, I have supported our space program unswervingly since its inception. I shall continue to support it so long as I believe it to be in the best interests of this country. However, Mr. President, it is readily apparent that if this program is to continue at its optimum speed, if the goals set for this decade are to be realized, it is past time for those who in 1961 placed this challenge before Congress to speak now with equal vigor and clarity in reaffirming the urgency in space.

## ADDRESSES BY SENATOR GOLDWATER BEFORE MILITARY ORDER OF WORLD WARS AND BEFORE REPUBLICAN WESTERN STATES CONFERENCE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] recently made two speeches that I believe to be of a major significance for all Americans. One was delivered in my own great State of Texas, in the historic city of San Antonio, before the Military Order of World Wars.